

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Original <input type="checkbox"/> Updated <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected	2. Date 07/26/24
3. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number (and Clearinghouse Number if applicable) HAS 6 to 8 (Permanent Rule)	
4. Subject Implementation of the Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology Licensure Compact	
5. Fund Sources Affected <input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEG-S	6. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected 20.165 (1) (g)
7. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget	
8. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply) <input type="checkbox"/> State's Economy <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Businesses/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Units <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utility Rate Payers <input type="checkbox"/> Small Businesses (if checked, complete Attachment A)	
9. Estimate of Implementation and Compliance to Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(1). \$0	
10. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Businesses, Local Governmental Units and Individuals Be \$10 Million or more Over Any 2-year Period, per s. 227.137(3)(b)(2)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
11. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule The Hearing and Speech Examining Board conducted a review of HAS 6 to 8 to implement the audiology and speech-language pathology interstate compact to ensure clarity and consistency with Wisconsin Statutes. The following updates were made as a result of this review: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section HAS 6.01 was updated to include compact privilege holders• A definition for "compact privilege" was added to HAS 6.02• A definition for "home state" was added to HAS 6.02• Section HAS 6.05 was created to address the requirements for applying for compact privileges• Section HAS 6.10 (1) (a) was revised to include a supervisor with compact privileges• Section HAS 6.16 was updated to include compact privilege holders• Various subsections of HAS 6.18 were updated to include compact privilege holders	
12. Summary of the Businesses, Business Sectors, Associations Representing Business, Local Governmental Units, and Individuals that may be Affected by the Proposed Rule that were Contacted for Comments. The rule was posted on the Department's website for 14 days to solicit public comment on economic impact, including how the proposed rules may affect businesses, local government units, and individuals. No comments were received.	
13. Identify the Local Governmental Units that Participated in the Development of this EIA. None.	
14. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred) DSPS estimates a total of \$35,800 in one-time and \$28,900 in annual ongoing costs for staffing and an indeterminate one-time IT impact to implement the bill. The one-time staff cost supports 0.9 limited term employee to undertake such tasks as amending and/or creating new application forms, working with Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) to create new methods and requirements in LicenseE and the compact databases, updating information on website, facilitating staff training, creating checklists, and participating in systems testing. The estimated annual cost supports 0.5	

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

full-time equivalent position for reviewing renewal applications, completing background checks, updating compact database with applicant and license holder information, updating privilege statuses, and responding to inquiries. An indeterminate amount of Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) hours at \$85 per hour and/ or contractor hours will be required to provide LicensE integration and to align with software and payment systems of other states included in compact. The one-time and ongoing estimated costs cannot be absorbed in the currently appropriated agency budget.

15. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

The benefits of implementing this rule are that the Hearing and Speech Examining Board's section of the Administrative Code will be aligned with Wisconsin State Statutes.

16. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

The long range implications of implementing this rule is clear requirements for practicing Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology in Wisconsin under compact privileges.

17. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

None.

18. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Illinois: Illinois has pending legislation regarding the Audiology and Speech-language Pathology Interstate Compact [2023 Illinois House Bill 3264].

Iowa: Iowa is a member state of the Audiology and Speech-language Pathology interstate compact [Iowa Code Title IV Chapter 147F].

Michigan: Michigan has not enacted the Audiology and Speech-language Pathology Interstate Compact [Michigan Compiled Laws Act 368 Part 176 Section 333.17601-333.17613].

Minnesota: Minnesota has pending legislation regarding the Audiology and Speech-language Pathology Interstate Compact [2023 House Bill HF2378 and Senate Bill SF2656].

19. Contact Name

Nilajah Hardin, Administrative Rules Coordinator

20. Contact Phone Number

(608) 267-7139

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for each Small Business Sector, Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

3. Did the agency consider the following methods to reduce the impact of the Rule on Small Businesses?

- Less Stringent Compliance or Reporting Requirements
- Less Stringent Schedules or Deadlines for Compliance or Reporting
- Consolidation or Simplification of Reporting Requirements
- Establishment of performance standards in lieu of Design or Operational Standards
- Exemption of Small Businesses from some or all requirements
- Other, describe:

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

- Yes No
-